



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

TM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/401,251	09/23/1999	CATHERINE M. KEENE	A0653-1160	4434
7590		06/19/2007	EXAMINER	
DAVID R. STEVENS			PHAM, HUNG Q	
STEVENS & WESTBERG, LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
99 NORTH FIRST STREET			2168	
SUITE 201				
SAN JOSE, CA 95113				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/401,251	KEENE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG Q. PHAM	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph

- Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants at Page 13 of the Remarks:

The rejection of claim 1, that the limitation "the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object" was not described in the specification is respectfully traversed. Applicant traverses on the basis that the specification does teach this clause using slightly different language, and that the minor rewording of the specification language is permissible since no new material was added.

The specification teaches that objects have "access criteria" (see, for example, specification page 22 lines 1-2) and that "data is contained in the object" (specification page 11, lines 14-15). The specification also teaches that there are different versions of objects (see, for example "a version of the requested object", specification page 20 line 15.).

Further, applicant respectfully submits that specification Figures 5 and 6 give detailed examples of how "access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object" works within this system to produce useful business results.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Page 22 Lines 1-2 and Page 11 Lines 14-15 discloses that access criteria is established for an object in a database, e.g., the OEM can establish an object stored in database 144 and set privilege access criteria (Specification, Page 22 Lines 1-2) to limit access to sections of data, e.g., a host user further has the ability to limit sections of data contained in the object (Specification, Page 11 Lines 14-15). Page 20 Line 15 illustrates a version of the requested object, which reveals information in which the user has privileged access, is sent to a user, e.g., the retention system may then send a version of the

Art Unit: 2168

requested object or associated information, which reveals information in which the guest user has privileged access.

In light of the Specification, especially at the particular pages as discussed, access criteria is established on the original object in the database, and based on the access criteria, a version of the requested object indicates only information in which the user has privileged access or a version of the requested object is sent.

Thus, access criteria is established to define the scope of access of an object, not for a version of the object as recited in the claim 1, e.g., *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object.*

FIG. 5, especially at Page 22 Lines 1-2 discloses that access criteria is established for an object in a database as discussed above. FIG. 6 indicates sections of data, which are contained in an object, is limited by access criteria (Page 22 Lines 10-17).

In light of FIGS. 5 and 6, especially at the particular pages as discussed, access criteria is established on the original object in the database, and based on the access criteria, a version of the requested object indicates only information in which the user has privileges is accessed.

Thus, access criteria is established to define the scope of access of an object, not for a version of the object as recited in the claim 1, e.g., *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object.*

In light of the foregoing arguments, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is sustained.

- Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants at Page 14 of the Remarks:

Art Unit: 2168

Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim 7 limitation "the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained with the version of the redacted object transferred" on the grounds that this language is also simply a minor rewording of teaching that is fully supported in the specification.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 7 recites features, which are similar to claim 1, were not supported by the Specification as discussed above. Therefore, the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is sustained.

- Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants at Page 15 of the Remarks:

Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejection of the wording of the claimed limitations of claims 13, 14, 15, and 16 on similar grounds. Applicant respectfully submits that as per the analysis of claim 1 and 7, the claimed limitations teaching access criteria, groups of data, redacted objects, privilege access criteria are, in fact, extensively described in the specification. Here figures 5 and 6 and the associated specification (page 20 line 19 to page 23 line 14 are particularly useful because they express these complicated concepts in a simplified format.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims 13-16 recite features, which are similar to claim 1, were not supported by the Specification as discussed above. Therefore, the rejection of claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is sustained.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 was objected to because of the following informalities: *a object request* at line 22 (*an object request* is respectfully suggested). The objection of claim 15 is sustained because the objected limitation has not been amended.

Duplicate Claims, Warning

The warning of duplication has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

- The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, *the operation* (Line 26), *said application code* (Line 29), *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object* (Lines 29-30¹) in the claim.
- The rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, *the ability of a user*, *the transferred redacted version* and *the requested object* in the claim.
- The rejection of claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, *the ability* and *the requested object* in the claims.

¹ As recited at Lines 7-8, access criteria are associated with groups of data, which are included in an object, not a version of an object as recited at Lines 29-30.

Art Unit: 2168

- The rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, *the access, the product chain, the transferred redacted version* in the claims.

- The rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, *the database, the transferred version, the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within the version of the redacted object*, in the claims. Additionally, the claimed limitation, *the redacted version of the object*, references to a plurality of “redacted version of an object” in the claim, one at Line 20 and another one at Line 23. It is unclear what “redacted version of an object” is being referenced.

- The rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained because *the redacted version of the object* as recited in claim 8 references to a plurality of “redacted version of an object” in claim 8 and claim 1. It is unclear what “redacted version of an object” is being referenced.

- The rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained because the claimed limitation, *the version of the object*, references to other items in the claims. It is unclear what item is being referenced.

- The rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation *the requestor* in the claim.

- The rejection of claims 15 and 16 has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 7 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, the claimed limitation, *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object*, was not described in the specification.

Regarding claim 7, the claimed limitation, *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within the version of the redacted object transferred*, was not described in the specification.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, the claimed limitation, *establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user*, was not described in the specification.

Art Unit: 2168

Regarding claim 15, the claimed limitations, *establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user and setting up a redacted version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges for transmission to the individual user* were not described in the specification.

Regarding claim 16, the claimed limitation, *establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access permitted to a user of a version of an object... receiving an object request by a user via a network for access to a version of an object... setting up a version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges*, was not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, *the operation* (Line 26), *said application code* (Line 29), *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object* (Lines 29-30) in the claim.

Regarding claim 2, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, *the ability of a user, the transferred redacted version and the requested object* in the claim.

Regarding claims 3-5, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, the ability and the requested object in the claims.

Regarding claim 6, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, the access, the product chain, the transferred redacted version in the claims.

Regarding claim 7, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations, the database, the transferred version, the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within the version of the redacted object, in the claims. Additionally, the claimed limitation, the redacted version of the object, references to a plurality of "redacted version of an object" in the claim, one at Line 20 and another one at Line 23. It is unclear what "redacted version of an object" is being referenced.

Regarding claim 8, the claimed limitation, the redacted version of the object, references to a plurality of "redacted version of an object" in the claims. It is unclear what "redacted version of an object" is being referenced.

Regarding claim 11, the claimed limitation, the version of the object, references to other items in the claims. It is unclear what item is being referenced.

Regarding claim 12, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation the requestor in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et al. [USP 6,314,409 B2] in view of Mukherjee et al. [USP 5,317,729].

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Schneck teaches a method and a business-entity data-exchange system *for providing the transfer of and the controlled access to a version of an object and other associated information of a file by a plurality of users* (Abstract and Col. 17 Lines 53-64). The Schneck system comprises:

a database for storing an object and associated information, the object comprising distinguishable groups of data (a book, a movie, software program or a legal document is considered as *an object and associated information* (Col. 33 Line 16-Col. 34 Line 18). The digital object is stored in a database (Col. 2 Lines 61-67). In term of a book, abstract, index and various chapters and

sections comprises text and figures is considered as *distinguishable groups of data* (Col. 33 Lines 16-20)),

each group of data having associated access criteria for access to the groups of data (In term of a book, *the groups of data*, e.g., abstract, index and various chapters and sections, *having associated access criteria for access*, e.g., abstract and index could be browsed, but other data are protected (Col. 33 Lines 20-29));

said data comprising multiple elements selected from the group consisting of product data, supply chain data, component part data, subcontracting company data, partnership data, design data, development data, access privilege data, trade secret data, confidential information data, business relationship data, business document data, business agreements data, OEM products and component data, CEM products and component data, bill of material data, change order data, component part object data, component part linking data, component part identification data, component part number data, part attribute data, part affiliation data, part product context data, specifications drawing data, color data, size data, type data, price data, quantity data, find number data, cross reference data, related information data, earlier version data, history of change data, text document data, graphics drawing data, other attribute data, redacted data, discovery privilege data, cost data, component parts specifications data, product specifications data quantity received data, quantity needed data, availability data, supplier type data, geographical information, and purchase order data (As shown in FIG. 18A, in term of a book, data comprising *text document data*, e.g., text 200, and *graphics drawing data*, e.g., figures 202 as *multiple elements*);

an application server configured to control access to data stored in the database and to set up and send a document file having a representation of an object and associated documents that are stored in the database (Col. 9 Line 59-Col. 10 Line 13, distributor 102 as *application server* is configured to control access to data by access mechanism 114 and packaged data 108 as *a document file having a representation of an object and text/graphics as associated documents is set up and sent*);

a memory for storing software code for controlling the operation of the application server (Col. 10, Lines 31-39 and Col. 15 Lines 41-49);

access data application code stored in the memory and executable by the application server (Col. 15, Lines 41-49),

said application code being responsive to the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object and to predetermined modification privileges for allowing controlled access to modify individual groups of data contained within the version of the object by an individual user (In term of a book, the original book as shown in FIG. 21A and a version of the original book is shown in FIG. 21B (Col. 33 Line 66-Col. 34 Line 7). A version of the original book includes redacted data and non-redacted data (FIG. 21B), wherein *the groups of data*, e.g., abstract, index and various chapters and sections, *having associated access criteria for access*, e.g., abstract and index could be browsed, but other data are protected (Col. 33 Lines 20-29). Access right includes predetermined modification privilege for allowing modification as *controlled access* to modify a copy of the primary distribution (Col. 25 Lines 30-31), which is the version of the book as in FIG. 21B));

and wherein the version of the object may be viewed or modified by said individual user is a redacted version where the data that is redacted varies according to said individual user's predetermined access or modification privilege (A version of the original book is shown in FIG. 21B, wherein non-redacted data, e.g., abstract and index, can be viewed by a user (Col. 33 Lines 20-29). The version of the original book is shown in FIG. 21B is *a redacted version* (FIG. 21B). Data is accessed in various controlled way, depending on the access rules (Col. 10 Lines 1-5). In term of a book, the redacted and non-redacted data are varies according to predetermined access rules);

and in which said predetermined access or modification privileges of said individual user vary according to the payment between the business entity that said individual user is affiliated with and

the business entity that controls said data exchange system (As in FIG. 1, the distributor 102 is *the business entity that controls said data exchange system*. The qualities and quantities of access made available by the owner to a group of users as *business entity that said individual user is affiliated* (Col. 23 Line 65-Col. 24 Line 1). Access rules are varies based on the fee for the distributor 102 (Col. 23 Line 66-Col. 24 Line 14). Thus, based on the fee for using digital object, e.g., software, book, predetermined access are varies).

The missing of Schneck is the claimed limitation in the preamble, *business partners or potential business partners producing products and component parts throughout a product supply chain* and the predetermined access vary according to *the status of the business partnership*.

Mukherjee teaches a method and system for controlling access to documents. Mukherjee further discloses *business partners or potential business partners producing products and component parts throughout a product supply chain* (Business partners, e.g., design engineering, manufacturing engineering... as in FIG. 3 of Mukherjee, producing products and component parts as shown in FIG. 4 of Mukherjee throughout a product supply chain, e.g., pre-release, released, accepted... as in FIG. 4) and the predetermined access vary according to *the status of the business partnership* (As in FIG. 4 of Mukherjee, predetermined access vary according to status, e.g., design engineering, manufacturing engineering...)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply to technique of controlling access to business partners producing product and component parts throughout a product supply chain and control access according to status of user groups in order to control trade secrets and confidential information in a manufacturer.

Regarding claim 2, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Schneck further discloses *the access*

data application code enables the ability of a user to read the contents of the transferred redacted version of the requested object that was sent by the application server according to access privileges associated with the user (Col. 25, Lines 6-58 and Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7).

Regarding claim 3, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 2, Schneck further discloses *the access data application code includes the ability to modify the contents of the version of the requested object* (Col. 26, Lines 30-31).

Regarding claim 4, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Schneck further discloses *the ability to modify includes the ability to delete information contained in the version of the requested object* (Col. 26, Lines 30-31).

Regarding claim 5, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Schneck further discloses *the ability to modify includes the ability to add data to the version of the requested object* (Col. 26, Lines 30-31).

Regarding claim 6, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Schneck further discloses *the transferred version of the object is configured to reveal limited information according to a guest user's predetermined access privileges* (Col. 33 Line 66-Col. 34 Line 7). Mukherjee teaches *the access to the version of the object is determined by a business relationship to produce products and defined by the host according to the need of information in the product chain* (FIG. 3).

Art Unit: 2168

Regarding claim 8, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Schneck further discloses the step of *receiving an object request by a requestor* (Col. 17 Lines 45-52); *verifying the requestor's user privilege access criteria* (Col. 18 Lines 47-48); *transmitting a redacted version of an object configured to reveal information contained with in the redacted version of the object according to the requestor's user privilege access criteria* (Col. 33, Line 6-Col. 34, Line 7).

Regarding claim 9, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Schneck further discloses the step of *establishing a version of an object by loading information into the version of the object into separate groups having separate access privilege criteria* (FIG. 21a, Col. 33 Lines 66-67; Col. 25 Lines 15-55).

Regarding claim 12, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Schneck further discloses the step of *transmitting a redacted version of an object by sending an electronic object to the requestor that contains the groups of information to which the requestor has access to and that excludes groups of information associated with an object that is redacted so that the requestor has limited access* (Col. 33 Line 6-Col. 34 Line 7).

Regarding claims 13 and 14, Schneck teaches *a business-entity data-exchange computer program product for use with a computer system, a central processing unit and means coupled to the central processing unit for storing a database to automatically manage objects for viewing and marking an object having varying formats without the use of any originating application of a file to view the object* (Abstract), comprising:

computer readable code means for establishing an object in a storage location (a book, a movie, software program or a legal document as disclosed (Col. 33 Line 16-Col. 34 Line 18) is considered as *an object, a storage location* is an inherited feature of a digital document);

said object containing data comprising multiple elements selected from the group consisting of product data, supply chain data, component part data, subcontracting company data, partnership data, design data, development data, access privilege data, trade secret data, confidential information data, business relationship data, business document data, business agreements data, OEM products and component data, CEM products and component data, bill of material data, change order data, component part object data, component part linking data, component part identification data, component part number data, part attribute data, part affiliation data, part product context data, specifications drawing data, color data, size data, type data, price data, quantity data, find number data, cross reference data, related information data, earlier version data, history of change data, text document data, graphics drawing data, other attribute data, redacted data, discovery privilege data, cost data, component parts specifications data, product specifications data quantity received data, quantity needed data, availability data, supplier type data, geographical information, and purchase order data (As shown in FIG. 18A, in term of a book, data comprising *text document data*, e.g., text 200, and *graphics drawing data*, e.g., figures 202 as *multiple elements*);

computer readable code means for identifying a user to have limited access to information associated with the object (Col. 15 Lines 30-35);

computer readable code means for establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user (Col. 25, Lines 15-58);

computer readable code means for receiving an object request by a requestor (Col. 17, Lines 45-52);

computer readable code means for verifying the requestor's user privilege access criteria (Col. 18, Lines 47-48); and

computer readable code means for transmitting a redacted version of the requested object in the form of a redacted document that masks information according to the requestor's user privilege access criteria (Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7);

Art Unit: 2168

in which said user privilege access criteria vary according to the payment between the business entity that said individual user is affiliated with and the business entity that controls said data exchange system (As in FIG. 1, the distributor 102 is *the business entity that controls said data exchange system*. The qualities and quantities of access made available by the owner to a group of users as *business entity that said individual user is affiliated* (Col. 23 Line 65-Col. 24 Line 1). Access rules are varies based on the fee for the distributor 102 (Col. 23 Line 66-Col. 24 Line 14). Thus, based on the fee for using digital object, e.g., software, book, predetermined access are varies).

The missing of Schneck is *the status of the business partnership* that makes the user privilege access criteria vary.

Mukherjee teaches a method and system for controlling access to documents.

Mukherjee further discloses the predetermined access vary according to *the status of the business partnership* (As in FIG. 4 of Mukherjee, predetermined access vary according to status, e.g., design engineering, manufacturing engineering...)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply to technique of controlling access according to status of user groups in order to control confidential information in a manufacturer.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Schneck teaches a computer server *having a database for storing data pertaining to product information, a method of securely transferring data between a source and an access destination* (Abstract) comprising:

establishing an object in a storage location (Col. 33, Line 16-Col. 34, Line 18, a book, a movie, software program or a legal document as disclosed is considered as *an object, a storage location is an inherited feature of a digital document*);

said object containing data comprising multiple elements selected from the group consisting of product data, supply chain data, component part data, subcontracting company data, partnership data, design data,

Art Unit: 2168

development data, access privilege data, trade secret data, confidential information data, business relationship data, business document data, business agreements data, OEM products and component data, CEM products and component data, bill of material data, change order data, component part object data, component part linking data, component part identification data, component part number data, part attribute data, part affiliation data, part product context data, specifications drawing data, color data, size data, type data, price data, quantity data, find number data, cross reference data, related information data, earlier version data, history of change data, text document data, graphics drawing data, other attribute data, redacted data, discovery privilege data, cost data, component parts specifications data, product specifications data quantity received data, quantity needed data, availability data, supplier type data, geographical information, and purchase order data (As shown in FIG. 18A, in term of a book, data comprising *text document data*, e.g., text 200, and *graphics drawing data*, e.g., figures 202 as *multiple elements*);

identifying a user to have limited access to the object (Col. 15, Lines 30-35);

establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user (Col. 25, Lines 15-58);

receiving a object request by an individual user (Col. 17, Lines 45-52);

verifying the individual user's privilege access criteria (Col. 18, Lines 47-48);

setting up a redacted version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges for transmission to the individual user; and transmitting the redacted version of the requested object, wherein the access criteria defines the information in which an individual user has privileges of access to the redacted version of the requested object (Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7);

in which said privilege access criteria vary according to the payment between the business entity that said individual user is affiliated with and the business entity that controls said data exchange system (As in FIG. 1, the distributor 102 is *the business entity that controls said data exchange system*. The qualities and quantities of access made available by the owner to a group of users as *business entity that said individual user is affiliated* (Col. 23 Line 65-Col. 24 Line 1). Access rules are varies based on the

fee for the distributor 102 (Col. 23 Line 66-Col. 24 Line 14). Thus, based on the fee for using digital object, e.g., software, book, predetermined access are varies).

The missing of Schneck is *the status of the business partnership* that makes the user privilege access criteria vary.

Mukherjee teaches a method and system for controlling access to documents.

Mukherjee further discloses the predetermined access vary according to *the status of the business partnership* (As in FIG. 4 of Mukherjee, predetermined access vary according to status, e.g., design engineering, manufacturing engineering...)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply to technique of controlling access according to status of user groups in order to control confidential information in a manufacturer.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et al. [USP 6,314,409 B2] and Mukherjee et al. [USP 5,317,729] as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Hayes et al. [WO 95/14266].

Regarding claim 11, Schneck and Mukherjee, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 8, Schneck further discloses the step of *verifying the requestor's user identification and identifying the groups of data within the version of the object to which the requestor has access* (Col. 18, Lines 56-58 and Col. 24, Lines 52-65). The missing of Schneck and Mukherjee is the step of *extracting the requestor's user identification from the object request*.

Hayes teaches the steps of *extracting the requestor's user identification from the object request* (Hayes, FIG. 1).

Art Unit: 2168

By applying the technique *extracting the user's user identification from the object request as taught by Hayes*, the processing time of verifying user name and password will be improved significantly.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2168

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



HUNG Q PHAM
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2168

May 29, 2007